

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

video signal then undergoes compression coding by the coding means. Then the color frame information, which was previously extracted from the input video signal, is added back to the compressed video signal. The color frame information is not compression information.

Additionally, the color frame information that is added to the video compressed signal is not new information. On the contrary, the color frame information that is extracted prior to compressing the video signal is merely added back to the video signal. Therefore, the CF information is not new compression information or new compression data regarding new compression processing as in Applicants' independent claims 1, 6, and 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that Asai does not disclose or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 15.

As stated above, the CF information in Asai is not new compression information and the CF information does not pertain to controlling the degree of compression (col. 3, lines 34-57). Therefore, Applicants submit that Asai does not disclose or suggest controlling the degree of compression of the image data based on new compression information as in Applicants' dependent claims 2, 7 and 16.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, the disclosure at col. 6, lines 15-25 does not relate to decompressing the compressed image data based on the new compression information. The Examiner considers the color frame information to correspond to Applicants' new compression information (pages 3-4 of the Office Action). It is clear from the disclosure at col. 6, lines 6-25 and Fig. 2, that the CF information is extracted prior to the MPEG decoder decoding (decompressing) the compressed data. Therefore, the data in Asai is not decompressed based on the compression information added to the compressed data.

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Further, claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 16 depend from independent claims 1, 6 and 15, which we do not believe to be anticipated or obvious over Asai. Thus, these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 5, 12, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,517,246 (“Suzuki”).

The Examiner asserts that Suzuki discloses displaying the compression information together with an image represented by the decompressed image data (col. 7, lines 1-14).

Suzuki discloses that the reproducer reproduces the moving-picture information in order to reproduce the picture. Thus, in Suzuki only the reproduced picture is displayed on a CRT display. The image display in Suzuki does not display compression information together with an image represented by the decompressed image data. Therefore, the image display in Suzuki does not disclose or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 5, 12, and 14.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 3-4, 8, 11 and 17-19 have been objected to as allegedly depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As stated above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 15 are not anticipated or obvious over Asai. Additionally, claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 16 are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency. Therefore, claims 3-4, 8, 11 and 17 are not dependent

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111


on a rejected base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

The Examiner's reasons for allowance are that, "None of the prior art disclose or fairly suggest wherein, judging, from compression information already added to the image data and the newly added compression information, a degree of quality degradation of the image data after the compression and issuing a warning in the case where the degree of quality degradation reaches a predetermined level or higher."

Contrary to the Examiner's Statement, Applicants submit that each claim is patentable based on its own language and not based on any paraphrasing or addition of language that may have been made by the Examiner.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer R. Leach
Registration No. 54,257

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 7, 2005